

## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in the representation of couches: the light upper rail of the Greek couch, the weakness of the incised leg, and the weak turned leg on some heavy Roman couches. Some working drawings by a modern furniture designer make clearer the methods of construction. It appears from the drawings that the constructional defects shown in the couches on Greek vases are real, although not so radical as to make one distrust the correctness of the representations. On the whole, the history of this industrial art follows the same lines as the higher arts. The ornament of earlier couches consists mainly of double volutes, palmettes, rosettes, and link designs. With the appearance of carved *julcra* on couches with turned legs, the artistic interest centers in this plastic ornament. For the later Roman "sofas" less is known about ornamentation; probably richness of material in a measure took the place of artistic decoration.

I have found no discussion in this volume of certain questions on which I should have been glad of Miss Ransom's opinion; e. g., as to the peculiarities of the *lectus triclinaris*, if such existed; or again as to the exact position of the *fulcrum* on the couch frame (cf. Baumeister, Fig. 329, and *Jahrb. d. arch. Inst.* XV, A. A. 178, for two slightly different positions). And one regrets that Miss Ransom was unable to carry farther her researches in Italian museums (p. 7).

A. F.

The Gospel of Mark. With Notes and Vocabulary. By WILLIAM PRENTISS DREW. Boston: Benj. H. Sanborn & Co. Pp. 133. \$0.75.

The general neglect of the New Testament in the Greek classes of our schools is a matter of sincere regret. It is quite as desirable that college students should become familiar with Hellenistic Greek as with the Doric or Aeolic or Ionic dialect. And the greatest and best specimen of Hellenistic Greek is found in the books of the New Testament. It would also be a great help and encouragement to the high-school student who has found Greek so difficult, if it could be made practicable for him to read in the simple, easy Greek of the first century one or more of the familiar gospels. One reason why this has not been done more extensively is that we have had no textbook made to meet such needs. That want Professor Drew has essayed with this little edition of the gospel by Mark to supply. But in attempting to adapt his book at the same time to the needs of the college student in a "rapid reading" class and the high-school pupil in his preparatory work, he has, in the average, missed both; but the great bulk of the notes would prove far more enlightening to the high-school boy, who needs this sort of drill in forms and syntax, than to the college man, who has all that behind him. The same note repeated again and again, the mass of grammatical references, the notes in the form of questions addressed to the reader, the explanation of simple forms and constructions could be helpful only to the beginner.

But the usefulness of the book to the beginner is much impaired by the inaccuracies which fairly swarm through it.

Carelessness in the proofreading is apparent from the large number of wrong accents: e. g., μαθήτης (p. 62), μάλλον (p. 82), κάρπος (p. 73), έλθούσα (p. 76), αὐτής (p. 81); these are only a few of the many that might be cited.

To adopt in a book intended for academies and colleges such spellings as (Westcott and Hort's) τεσσεράκοντα (i. 13), συνζητεῖν (i. 27 and note), ἐκαθερίσθη (i. 42 and note), ἀγαπậν (xii. 33 and note) is hardly commendable policy, when correct spellings and forms have as strong manuscript authority as they do.

The notes are largely grammatical, "intended to explain the Greek, without going further into the exegesis." But even in the explanation of matters of syntax they too often go wide of the mark; e. g., viii. 35:  $\delta s$   $\delta v$   $\delta m$   $\delta m$   $\delta m$   $\delta m$  would not be used here in classic Greek." In support of this the editor quotes Hadley-Allen 899, which, as it deals with particular conditions, has nothing to do with the case. In such a sentence, with a  $\delta s$   $\delta v$   $\theta \epsilon h \eta$  preceding,  $\delta v$  certainly would be used in classical Greek, and  $\delta m$   $\delta m$   $\delta m$   $\delta m$   $\delta m$  preceding,  $\delta v$  certainly authority here), instead of  $\delta m$   $\delta m$  very often in N. T. introduces direct discourse"—as if it did not do the same in classical Greek. The editor still labors under the delusion that the apodosis of a conditional sentence (the independent clause) is dependent upon the protasis (the dependent clause); compare the muddle he makes of  $\delta m$   $\delta m$ 

The translations in the notes are, for the most part, good and suggestive. But some are misleading rather than helpful; e. g., ħν ἐνδεδυμένος (i. 6) might once have been "had been clothed," but compound tenses were in apostolic times long since a reality, so that to Mark ħν ἐνδεδυμένος meant simply "was clothed." κρατήσας (i. 31): "this is well translated taking"—not nearly so well translated as it would be, if the aorist participle were rendered with more exactness; "he took her by the hand and raised her up." ὅπαγε (ii. 11): "go secretly." The meaning of ὑπό in this verb was in the days of Mark almost completely lost. It is used upward of seventy-five times in the New Testament, and in very few instances can the meaning of secrecy be forced into it. It means simply "go," as in modern Greek.

The vocabulary also is not free from faults. It seems as if it were made from a text different from his own; e. g., Beedfeboup (sic!); but in the text we find Beefebour.  $\sigma a \tau a \nu$  and  $\sigma a \tau a \nu a \tau a \nu$  so that in the text  $\Sigma a \tau a \nu$  and  $\Sigma a \tau a \nu a \tau a \nu$ .

Even the text, which is, with few changes, that of Westcott and Hort, has many faults. Letters are left out, accents and punctuation marks misplaced; e. g., the dropping out of the  $\sigma$  of  $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \sigma \pi d\rho a \xi \epsilon \nu$  (ix.20) produced such a monstrosity that the editor did not venture to put anything even remotely resembling it, not even the correct word, into his vocabulary. In xi. 9–10 we find  $\Omega$ C NNA′ and it is followed by a whole line in solid capitals, with a full panoply of breath-

ings and accents—a miscarried imitation of the peculiar type of Westcott and Hort's quotations, not attempted except in this particular verse. As a recompense for the waste of accents on those capitals, the accent is omitted from  $\eta\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$  in the next line. Words are also wrongly divided at the end of the line; e. g.,  $\xi\xi l\sigma$ - $\tau a\nu\tau o$  (p. 21).

School editions of the New Testament are certainly a desideratum, but this one unfortunately leaves much yet to be desired.

W. M.

Denkmäler griechischer und römischer Sculptur. By A. Furtwängler and H. L. Urlichs. Zweite Auflage. München: Bruckmann, 1904. Pp. xii+179; 52 plates. M. 4.50.

This is the *Handausgabe* to accompany and supplement the folio plates issued under the same title for use in the German schools. All the folio plates are reproduced in full-page half-tones in this volume, which also contains in the text many smaller figures. The illustrations are of excellent quality, and paper, print, and binding are alike attractive.

The plates are discussed in ten groups: I, "Archaic Art;" II, "Statues of Gods from the Fifth Century;" III, "Other Sculpture from the Fifth Century;" IV, "Statues of Gods from the Fourth Century;" V, "Greek Statues of Athletes;" VI, "Grave Monuments;" VII, "Statuary Groups;" VIII, "Hellenistic Art;" IX, "Historical Art of the Romans;" X, "Greek and Roman Portraits."

The introductions prefixed to the discussions of the plates of the various groups are admirable, yet it may be questioned whether there is not here too much subdivision. The beginner would probably better understand the spirit and evolution of classic sculpture had our authors used simply the broad general subdivisions of "Archaic," "Fifth Century," "Fourth Century," "Hellenistic," and "Roman Sculpture;" for then athletes, grave monuments, groups, and portraits would be found in their proper historical connection, and Hellenistic art would not seem to be limited to the "Nile" and the "Dying Gaul."

In selecting fifty-six plates and thirty-one text figures to represent the entire development of Greek and Roman sculpture it is not to be expected that all critics will agree. Yet, in fifth-century art it is difficult to understand why the problematical "Praxitelian" Colossus from Monte Cavallo, or the Orpheus Relief—two figures of which, at least, are close imitations of figures on the Parthenon Frieze—or the Medusa Rondanini should be chosen, while such sculpture as the Delphian Charioteer and the Olympia Gables are omitted. In the fourth century, too, space is found for the "Eubouleus" head and for the Vatican Melpomene, but none for the Mausoleum Frieze. Again, among "Statuary Groups" we look in vain for the Pergamon Altar, but we find the Venice Odysseus.

The discussions of the various plates are, however, models, packed with